

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-reference application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-29 are pending in the application.

Claim 14 is amended to correct an informality. No change has been made to the claim scope.

Claims 1-6, 8, 11-23, 25, and 28-29 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,507,817 to Wolfe et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth below.

Each of the independent claims provides an arrangement that enables a user to provide voice-activated commands for execution of messaging operations by a messaging server. For example, independent claims 1 and 18 specify “identifying the messaging operation in the application server by interpreting the audio file”; independent claims 11 and 14 specify receiving an HTTP request having an audio file that stores voice signals specifying a messaging operation, and a device (e.g., executable application runtime environment in claim 11 or generating means in claim 14) configured for “outputting a selected function call specifying the messaging operation”; claim 28 specifies a method in a browser that generates “a first file, that specifies a messaging operation... based on voice signals received from a user and that specify the messaging operation.”

Hence, a user of a telephony device can speak messaging operations that are interpreted by an interface between the user and the messaging server, enabling a telephony user to manage voice, e-mail, or fax messages without pressing DTMF digits or waiting for menu prompts.

Wolfe et al. does not disclose use of a speech recognition system, and hence does not disclose interpreting voice signals that specify a messaging operation, as claimed.

Referring to the rejection of claims 1, 11, 14, 18, and 28, the cited portion of col. 5, lines 16-

37 discloses use of HTTP-based requests by browsers (e.g., proxy browser 62 or web browser 56) to a web server for HTML pages that include XML tags that control playback of a supplied audio file by a “voice resource” (i.e., an executable resource that provides browser audio control of audio file). There is no disclosure that the voice resource interprets the audio file, as claimed.

Further (regarding the rejection of claims 2 and 19), the Abstract does not disclose a speech recognition process, but rather the opposite: a Text-to-Speech process (see lines 10-11 of Abstract: “[t]he application server converts the text-based form into an audible format.”).

Similarly, col. 7, line 57 to col. 8, line 6 and col. 8, lines 25-31 do not disclose speech recognition, but rather disclose a “text-to-speech resource 88 in order to listen to e-mail messages” (see col. 8, lines 1-2).

Hence, since Wolfe et al. does not disclose a speech recognition resource that enables identification of messaging operation by interpreting an audio file having voice signals specifying the messaging operation, the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

The indication of allowable subject matter in claims 7, 9, 10, 24, 26, and 27 is acknowledged and appreciated . It is believed that these claims are in allowable form in view of the foregoing.

In view of the above, it is believed this application is and condition for allowance, and such a Notice is respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including any missing or insufficient fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a), to Deposit Account No. 50-1130, under Order No. 95-423, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'L. R. Turkevich', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Leon R. Turkevich
Registration No. 34,035

Customer No. 23164
(202) 261-1059
Date: July 11, 2003